



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,211	08/06/2001	Travis Wayne Cavender	2001-IP-004118	8979

20558 7590 04/22/2003

KONNEKER SMITH
660 NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY
SUITE 230
PLANO, TX 75074

EXAMINER

SAFAVI, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3673

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/923,211	CAVENDER, TRAVIS WAYNE
	Examiner M. Safavi	Art Unit 3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the corresponding address.

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3673

1. It has been noted that the Office action of December 17, 2002 had inadvertently omitted claims 24-26 from the rejection involving Scott and had inadvertently omitted claims 24-26, 31, 34, and 35 from the rejection involving Pringle et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-16 and 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the language of claims 1-16, particularly claims 1 and 24, appears to set forth an invention within each of two statutory distinct inventions.

Claim 1 appears to present an article of manufacture as by reciting "...gas storage and production system, comprising a gas storage formation" then proceeds to recite "a production wellbore extending into the formation". However, lines 4-5 of claim 1 appear to present a method as with the recitation of "and withdrawing gas from the formation". See, also, lines 6-7 of claim 1 which recites "a storage wellbore extending into the formation" as well as "and injecting gas into the formation". It is therefore, not clear as to what is being defined by the language of claim 1. Claim 1 apparently, is directed to an article of manufacture, namely a production wellbore and a storage wellbore. Claim 1 apparently, is also directed to a method of injecting and withdrawing gas. Claims 2-16 variously recite what appears to be method or process limitations.

Art Unit: 3673

Claim 24 appears to present an article of manufacture as by reciting "...gas storage and production system, comprising...a main wellbore...a storage wellbore...and a production wellbore". However, lines 7-9 of claim 24 appear to present a method or process as with the recitation of "gas being injected from the main wellbore into the formation via the storage wellbore" as well as "gas being withdrawn from the formation into the main wellbore via the production wellbore". It is therefore, not clear as to what is being defined by the language of claim 24. Claim 24 apparently, is directed to an article of manufacture, namely a main wellbore, a storage wellbore and a production wellbore. Claim 24 apparently, is also directed to a method of injecting and withdrawing gas. Claims 25-35 variously recite article of manufacture limitations as well as method or process limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-16 and 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 appears to present an article of manufacture as by reciting "...gas storage and production system, comprising a gas storage formation" then proceeds to recite "a production wellbore extending into the formation". However, lines 4-5 of claim 1 appear to present a method

Art Unit: 3673

or process as with the recitation of “and withdrawing gas from the formation”. See, also, lines 6-7 of claim 1 which recites “a storage wellbore extending into the formation” as well as “and injecting gas into the formation”. It is therefore, not clear as to what is being defined by the language of claim 1. Claim 1 apparently, is directed to an article of manufacture, namely a production wellbore and a storage wellbore. It is not clear as to what the recitation of “and withdrawing gas from the formation” or “and injecting gas into the formation” serves to define. Claims 2-16, particularly claims 3, 4, 10, and 14, variously recite article of manufacture limitations as well as method or process limitations.

Claim 24 appears to present an article of manufacture as by reciting “...gas storage and production system, comprising...a main wellbore...a storage wellbore...and a production wellbore”. However, lines 7-9 of claim 24 appear to present a method or process as with the recitation of “gas being injected from the main wellbore into the formation via the storage wellbore” as well as “gas being withdrawn from the formation into the main wellbore via the production wellbore”. It is therefore, not clear as to what is being defined by the language of claim 24. Claim 24 apparently, is directed to an article of manufacture, namely a main wellbore, a storage wellbore and a production wellbore. It is not clear as to what the recitation of “gas being injected from the main wellbore into the formation via the storage wellbore, and gas being withdrawn from the formation into the main wellbore via the production wellbore” serves to define. Claims 25-35, particularly claims 26-28, 31, 34, and 35, variously recite article of manufacture limitations as well as method or process limitations.

Art Unit: 3673

Further, it is not clear as to how the “production wellbore” “[withdraws] gas from the formation” nor, particularly, how the “storage wellbore” “[injects] gas into the formation”. And, it is not clear as to how the “production wellbore” is “withdrawing gas from the formation” at the same time the “storage wellbore” is “injecting gas into the formation”. Also, it is not clear as to how the “gas [is] being injected from the main wellbore into the formation via the storage wellbore” at the same time the “gas [is] being withdrawn from the formation into the main wellbore via the production wellbore”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scott. Scott discloses, Fig. 3, first wellbore, (lower portion of 11), extending into a formation and a second wellbore 11a extending into a formation with well bore 11 intersecting wellbore 11a

Art Unit: 3673

at a wellbore junction. Main wellbore, (upper portion of 11), extends from the wellbore junction to the earth's surface. Tubular string 14 is positioned within the main wellbore.

6. Claims 1-5, 10, 14, 24-26, 31, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pringle et al. Pringle et al. discloses, Fig. 8, first wellbore 66 extending into a formation and a second wellbore 58 extending into a formation with well bore 66 intersecting wellbore 58 at a wellbore junction. Main wellbore, (portion extending from junction of 66 and 58), extends from the wellbore junction to the earth's surface. Tubular string 18 or 20 is positioned within the main wellbore with an annulus being formed around either of 18 or 20. First tubular string 18 and second tubular string 20 are positioned within the main wellbore.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed January 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to "...injects gas into the formation" or "injecting gas into a formation" appear to be directed to a method or process when the claims, as best understood, are directed to a formation or "system". The applied prior art does disclose the elements and features of the respectively rejected claims as has been set forth in the above rejections.

Art Unit: 3673

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Safavi whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.



MICHAEL SAFAVI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3673

M. Safavi
April 18, 2003